



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,998	01/03/2001	Atsushi Okada	1232-4670	1804

7590 06/07/2004

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
345 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER
----------

PHAM, KHANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/753,998

Applicant(s)

OKADA ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,8,11-19,22-25,27,30,33-40,44-50,52 and 54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,8,11-19,22-25,27,30,33-40,44-50,52 and 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.
2. Applicant's submission filed on 4/7/2004 has been entered. Claims 1 and 23 have been amended. Claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 20, 21, 26, 28, 31, 32, and 41-43 have been canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. **Claims 11-14, 33-36, 52, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - Claim 11 depends upon a canceled claim (claim 9).
  - Claims 12-14 depend upon a rejected claim (claim 10).
  - Claims 11-14 recite the limitation "said editing means" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Art Unit: 2177

- Claims 33-36 depend upon a canceled claim (claim 31).
- Claims 33-36 recite the limitation "said editing step". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
- Claim 52 depends upon canceled claim (Claim 6).
- Claim 54 depends upon a canceled claim (claim 28).

The scope of claims 11-14, 33-36, 52, 54 are so unclear that the Examiner could not conduct a reasonable search of the prior art. Thus, the Examiner did not make a prior art rejection to claims 11-14, 33-36, 52, 54 in this Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 15-19, 22-25, 27, 30, 37-40, 44-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carbonell et al. (US 6,163,785 A), hereinafter "Carbonell", and in view of Christy (US 5,884,247 A), hereinafter "Christy".

**As per claim 1**, Carbonell teaches a work standard creation system for creating a work standard data related to an assembly work of various goods comprising:

Art Unit: 2177

- "input display means for displaying a verb area, an object area, and an auxiliary word area where characters of a word are input" at Col. 19 lines 45-47;
- "retrieving means for retrieving verb words each having physically the character input in the verb area and each of which is from a word database, retrieving object words each having physically the character input in the object area from a word database, and retrieving auxiliary words each having physically the character input in the auxiliary word area from a word database" at Col. 20 lines 5-10 and lines 64-67;

(Carbonell discloses a specific example wherein the input character is "timing", the CSL database is searched and a list of CSL alternatives is retrieved. The CSL alternatives comprises words each having physically the input characters (i.e., "advance signal timing, advance timing groove, timing mechanism"))).

- "selecting means for selecting a verb word from the retrieved verb words, selecting an object word from the retrieved object words, and selecting an auxiliary word from the retrieved auxiliary words" at Col. 20 lines 30-37 and Col. 23 lines 30-45;

(Carbonell discloses that user "can select an alternative and substitute it for the word in the document". Carbonell also discloses that a sentence can be built using a verb, a nominative, an accusative and an instrument)

- "storage means for storing the selected verb, object and auxiliary word as a sentence of work standard in a memory" at Col. 8 lines 30-67.

(Carbonell teaches that document can be compiled from a set of smaller pieces or information elements, wherein an information element includes a shared block of text and is stored in the shared object libraries.)

The difference between Carbonell and the invention of claim 1 is that Carbonell does not explicitly teach that each type of word, such as verb word, object word, auxiliary word, are stored in separate databases, nor separate input area for each type of word as claimed. However, Christy teaches a similar method for automated language translator, wherein words of different types are stored in distinct databases at Col. 7 lines 30 (Christy uses physically or logically distinct databases for each linguistic units), and each type of word are displayed in separate area at Col. 11 lines 50-65 (Christy teaches: "each linguistic unit of a sentence appears in a separate line").

Carbonell and Christy are in the same field of art because they both describe an automated translation system to translate an input sentence to different languages utilizing word databases (See abstracts). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Carbonell and Christy's teaching. Modifying Carbonell's teaching by replacing a single database by multiple databases for each type of linguistic unit as suggested by Christy would allow faster searching and avoid ambiguity. Modifying Carbonell's teaching by utilizing

separate input areas for each linguistic unit would provide an "easily processed format that facilitates both straightforward identification of individual linguistic units and simple verification that the sequence of units qualifies as a legitimate sentences", as suggested by Christy at Col. 11 lines 45-55.

**As per claim 2**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: "identifier giving means for putting a plurality of work standards together into an upper work group and giving a group identifier to each of the groups put together" at Col. 8 lines 50-67 and Fig. 4.

**As per claim 3**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 2 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: "the work group is classified into one of a component group formed from a plurality of work standards, a model group formed from a plurality of components, and a genre group formed from a plurality of models" at Col. 8 lines 50-67 and Fig. 4.

**As per claim 5**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: "means for translating an expression of at least one of the selected verb, object and auxiliary word" at Col. 4 lines 47-53.

**As per claim 8**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 5 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: "said means for translating includes a conversion dictionary between a word in a language used in said system and a translated word in a language of a country where assembly is done" at Col. 13 lines 20-55.

**As per claim 15**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “means for selecting an arbitrary work standard, and means for attaching voice data having a content related to the work to the selected work standard” at Fig. 4, elements 460D, 410 and 450.

**As per claim 16**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “means for selecting an arbitrary work standard, and means for attaching image data having a content related to the work to the selected work standard” at Fig. 4, elements 460A, 430 and 450.

**As per claim 17**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 16 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “the image data is still image data” at Fig. 4, element 460A.

**As per claim 18**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “means for selecting an arbitrary work standard, and means for attaching, to the selected work standard, first image data having a content related to the work, voice data for explaining the work standard, and second image data for explaining a relationship between the voice data and the first image data” at Fig. 4, elements 460A, 460D, 410 and 450.

**As per claim 19**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “display means for displaying a plurality of work standards in an order of inputs by said input means” at Fig. 4, elements 450, 470, 480.

**As per claim 22**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system of claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches a distributed client/server database system comprising: "a server including said storage means of claim 1, and a plurality of clients each having said input means of claim 1" at Col. 6 line 62 to Col. 7 line 10.

**As per claims 23, 46**, Carbonell teaches a work standard creation method of creating work standard data related to an assembly work of various goods, comprising:

- "an input display step for displaying a verb area, an object area, and an auxiliary word area where characters of a word are input" at Col. 19 lines 45-47;
- "a retrieving step for retrieving verb words each having physically the character input in the verb area and each of which is from a verb database, retrieving object words each having physically the character input in the object area from an object database, and retrieving auxiliary words each having physically the character input in the auxiliary word area from an auxiliary word database" at Col. 20 lines 5-10 and lines 64-67;

(Carbonell discloses a specific example wherein the input character is "**timing**", the CSL database is searched and a list of CSL alternatives is retrieved. The CSL alternatives comprises words each having physically the input characters (i.e., "advance signal **timing**, advance **timing** groove, **timing** mechanism")) .

- "a selecting step for selecting a verb word from the retrieved verb words, selecting an object word from the retrieved object words, and selecting an

auxiliary word from the retrieved auxiliary words" at Col. 20 lines 30-37 and Col. 23 lines 30-45;

(Carbonell discloses that user "can select an alternative and substitute it for the word in the document". Carbonell also discloses that a sentence can be built using a verb, a nominative, an accusative and an instrument)

- "a storage step for storing the selected verb, object and auxiliary word as a sentence of work standard in a memory" at Col. 8 lines 30-67;

(Carbonell teaches that document can be compiled from a set of smaller pieces or information elements, wherein an information element includes a shared block of text and is stored in the shared object libraries.)

The difference between Carbonell and the invention of claims 23, 46 is that Carbonell does not explicitly teach that each type of word, such as verb word, object word, auxiliary word, are stored in separate databases, nor separate input area for each type of word as claimed. However, Christy teaches a similar method for automated language translator, wherein words of different types are stored in distinct databases at Col. 7 lines 30 (Christy uses physically or logically distinct databases for each linguistic units), and each type of word are displayed in separate area at Col. 11 lines 50-65 (Christy teaches: "each linguistic unit of a sentence appears in a separate line").

Carbonell and Christy are in the same field of art because they both describe an automated translation system to translate an input sentence to different languages utilizing word databases (See abstracts). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Carbonell and Christy's teaching. Modifying Carbonell's teaching by replacing a single database by multiple databases for each type of linguistic unit as suggested by Christy would allow faster searching and avoid ambiguity. Modifying Carbonell's teaching by utilizing separate input areas for each linguistic unit would provide an "easily processed format that facilitates both straightforward identification of individual linguistic units and simple verification that the sequence of units qualifies as a legitimate sentences", as suggested by Christy at Col. 11 lines 45-55.

**As per claim 24**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claims 23, 46 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: "an identifier giving step of putting a plurality of work standards together into an upper work group and giving a group identifier to each of the groups put together" at Col. 8 lines 50-67 and Fig. 4.

**As per claim 25**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 24 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: "the work group is classified into one of a component group formed from a plurality of work standards, a model group formed from a plurality of components, and a genre group formed from a plurality of models" at Col. 8 lines 50-67 and Fig. 4.

**As per claim 27**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 23 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “translating an expression of at least one of the selected verb, object or and auxiliary word” at Col. 4 lines 47-53.

**As per claim 30**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 27 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “in said step of translating, a conversion dictionary between a word in a language used in the system and a translated word in a language of a country where assembly is done is used” at Col. 13 lines 20-55.

**As per claim 37**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 23 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “a step of selecting an arbitrary work standard, and a step of attaching voice data having a content related to the work to the selected work standard” at Fig. 4, elements 460D, 410 and 450.

**As per claim 38**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 23 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “a step of selecting an arbitrary work standard, and a step of attaching image data having a content related to the work to the selected work standard” at Fig. 4, elements 460A, 430, and 450.

**As per claim 39**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 38 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “the image data is still image data” at Fig. 4, element 460A.

**As per claim 40**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 23 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “a step of selecting an arbitrary work standard, and a step of attaching, to the selected work standard, first image data having a content related to the work, voice data for explaining the work standard, and second

image data for explaining relationship between the voice data and the first image data” at Fig. 4, elements 460A, 460D, 410, and 450.

**As per claim 44**, Carbonell and Christy teach the method according to claim 39 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “the image data is moving image data” at Fig. 4, element 460E.

**As per claim 45**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 16 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: wherein “the image data is moving image data” at Fig. 4, element 460E.

**As per claim 47**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 16 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: wherein “the image data attached to the work standard comprises a plurality of still image data or one moving image data” at Fig. 4, elements 460A, 460E.

**As per claim 48**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 1 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: wherein “contents of works are classified in units of works, and a parameter is attached to each of the classified work contents” at Col. 8 lines 30-67.

**As per claim 49**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 48 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: wherein “a work and an image corresponding to an operation content of the work are linked to a parameter linked to the work content” at Col. 8 lines 30-67.

**As per claim 50**, Carbonell and Christy teach the system according to claim 49 as discussed above. Carbonell also teaches: “means for designating a name of an

operation and a value of a parameter related to the operation to search for image data of a corresponding work” at Col. 8 lines 30-67 and Fig. 4.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Applicant argued at pages 10-11 that Carbonell does not teach that characters are separately input each to be retrieved in different databases. The newly found Christy reference teaches a similar method wherein input words are separately entered and retrieved in different database. Motivation to combine references is provided in section 6 of this Office Action. The argument is therefore moot in view of new ground of rejection.

Applicant argued at page 11 that Carbonell does not teach retrieving words having physically the inputted characters. On the contrary, Carbonell discloses a specific example wherein the input character is “**timing**”, the CSL database is searched and a list of CSL alternatives is retrieved. The CSL alternatives comprises words each having physically the input characters (i.e., “advance signal **timing**, advance **timing** groove, **timing** mechanism”.)

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh B. Pham whose telephone number is (703) 308-7299. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Khanh B. Pham  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2177

KBP  
May 28, 2004

  
SRIPAMA CHANNAVALJALA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER